1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 HERBERT M. BELLINGER, JR., 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-02-2335 LKK GGH P 12 VS. 13 DEPUTY ALLBEE, et al., 14 Defendants. ORDER 15 16 On April 25, 2005, the court recommended that defendants' December 17, 2004, 17 summary judgment motion be granted in part and denied in part. In considering defendants' 18 motion, the court construed plaintiff's December 23, 2004, summary judgment motion, as an 19 opposition to defendants' motion. 20 The court did not treat plaintiff's December 23, 2004, motion as a cross-motion 21 because it was untimely. Pursuant to the October 13, 2004, order, the motion cut-off date was 22 December 17, 2004. The proof of service attached to plaintiff's December 23, 2004, summary 23 judgment motion states that plaintiff "placed" his motion in the "United States Mails" on 24 December 3, 2004. Plaintiff does not benefit from the "mailbox rule" because he mailed his 25 motion directly rather than delivering it to jail authorities for forwarding to the court. See

Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 273, 108 S.Ct. 2379 (1988).

26

## 

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's December 23, 2004,
2	summary judgment is construed as an opposition to defendants' December 17, 2004, summary
3	judgment motion.
4	DATED: 5/3/05
5	
6	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows
7	GREGORY G. HOLLOWS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8	
9	ggh:kj bell2335.ord
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	